# **Executive Summary**

The FY99 Annual Evaluation assesses the effectiveness of Army's civilian personnel system -from the morale, quality and representation of the work force to the effectiveness of
personnelists and managers. Where possible, performance was measured against objectives.
For some indicators, where objectives were not available, we compared Army performance
against DOD and Government-wide data. Whenever possible, we used historical data for
perspective. Key findings are reported below.

## **Cost/Efficiency**

- Streamlining efforts reduced the number of operating-level personnelists and administrative support. (pages 1, 7-9)
- Civilian strength continued to draw down. Actual FY99 civilian strength (military function)
  was 600 employees above target. The slight overexecution resulted from a concerted
  management effort to avoid the underexecution, which had resulted in the loss of Army
  funds in recent years. (page 10)
- As measured by the Civilian Productivity Reporting System (CivPro), productivity per serviced employee and productivity per personnelist have remained constant over the past five years. (pages 11-12)

#### **CPA Effectiveness**

- Customer satisfaction: Ratings have been relatively constant following a steep drop in FY97.
   (page 2)
- Regulatory and procedural compliance: Compliance of the management-employee relations program continues to hover around the 90% objective. Compliance of the staffing program has dropped below the objective for the past two years. (pages 4,14-15)
- Data quality: Objectives were met for two of the three measures. The one failure was caused by a one-time programming error. (pages 16-18)
- Timeliness of benefits processing: Average processing time improved, allowing Army to meet
   OPM's standard for the first time. (page 13)
- Timeliness of filling jobs: Average fill-time improved, dropping from 77 to 73 days.
   Although Army did not meet the 8% improvement objective, it did achieve a 5% improvement. (page 3)

# **Management Effectiveness**

- Grade and assignment accuracy: Both continue to hover around the 90% objective. (pages 5, 19-20)
- Regulatory and procedural compliance of TAPES: Pushing the 100% mark. (pages 5, 21)
- Labor-management relations: Army continues to do well in avoiding Unfair Labor Practice complaints, but arbitration decisions in favor of management decreased significantly this year. (pages 22-23)
- Controlling Federal Employees Compensation Act claims and costs: Positive trend continues. (pages 25-26)
- Estimating ACTEDS intern needs and executing allocated resources: Some MACOMs and career programs continue to pull Army's performance down. (page 29)
- Identifying emergency essential employees: MEDCOM continues to pull Army's performance down. (page 30)

#### **Work Force Morale**

- Attitude surveys show that supervisors have higher morale than do employees. Both groups are relatively satisfied with their jobs and supervisors. Both groups are relatively dissatisfied with their careers, management and promotion systems. (pages 6, 31-41)
- Formal grievances were low compared to historical levels. (pages 42-43)

### **Work Force Quality**

- The education level of civilian Army employees has been reasonably constant since FY91.
   Army's education level was similar to that of DOD but was lower than that of the Federal Government. Army's education level for professional series was nearly identical to that of DOD and that of the Federal Government. (pages 46-48)
- The rate of incentive awards has been reasonably constant since FY96. Army's incentive award rate was higher than the Federal Government rate, but lower than the DOD rate. (page 49)
- The rate of disciplinary and adverse actions has been reasonably constant since FY93.
   Army's rate of disciplinary and adverse actions is lower than the rates in DOD and the Federal Government. (page 50)

### **Work Force Representation**

- Army's percentage of minority employees was approximately the same as last year's. The
  percentage has increased slightly since FY90. It was similar to the DOD percentage but
  lower than that of the Federal Government. (pages 51-53)
- Army's percentage of female employees was approximately the same as last year's. The
  percentage has decreased since FY90. It was still slightly higher than the DOD
  percentage but lower than that of the Federal Government. (page 54)
- Army's percentage of disabled employees was approximately the same as last year's. The
  percentage increased between FY90-92 and has slowly declined since. It was lower than
  the DOD percentage but higher than that of the Federal Government. (page 55)